DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 062 EA 012 116

AUTHOR	Duvieusart, Baudouin
TITLE	Staff Training in a Period of Change in the Administration of Education Systems.
INSTITUTION	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris (France). International Inst. for Educational Planning.
REPORT NO	IIEP-SP-38
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	23p.: A contribution to the IIEP/SIDA Seminar on "Changing needs for training in educational planning and administration" (September 27-October 1, 1976)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Organization; Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Education; *Decentralization; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Government; Foreign Countries; *Inservice Education

ABSTRACT

The great changes that have taken place in educational systems in the last fifteen years have caused ministries of education to make considerable modification in their structure and ways of operating. These changes have been brought about by the explosion in the number of schools, the changes in public opinion regarding the role of education, and the public's increased desire to have a share in educational decision-making. These pressures have forced two main changes in administration. The first concerns the structure of the central administration. The new plan adopts a functional structure that usually includes divisions for planning and statistics, curriculum and methods, personnel management, management of buildings and equipment, and finance and budgetary control. The second big change is decentralization of authority. These changes have created great change in the work of central administrators and have created a need for inservice education to prepare administrators for both their specialized work in the sector to which they belong and their role as team members who support the work being done in outpost units. Training should employ a seminar format that uses higher officials to teach lower officials. (Author/IRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180062

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IIEP seminar paper: (38)

STAFF TRAINING IN A PERIOD OF CHANGE IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATION SYSTEMS

Baudouin Duvieusart

A contribution to the IIEP/SIDA Seminar on "Changing needs for training in educational planning and administration"
27 September - 1 October 1976

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE
FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING
(established by Unesco)
7-9, rue Eugène-Delacroix, 75016 Paris

© Unesco 1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Nieto
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 012 116

The opinions expressed in these papers are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Institute or of Unesco.

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	The changes that have taken place in the administration of education systems	1
II.	Decentralization in educational administration	4
III.	The training of administrative staff	12
Summary		18

The great changes that have taken place in education systems in the last fifteen years have caused the ministries to bring in considerable modifications of their structures and their way of operating, with reforms centering on the adoption of an organizational plan of functional character and on decentralization. These changes have not only led to an increase in the number of educational administrators to be trained; they are also affecting the type of experts needed and the way they are to be trained. This is what this paper endeavours to examine.

I. The changes that have taken place in the administration of education systems

Working in a ministry of education, one often gets the impression that neither the system of education nor its administrative infrastructure change in any noticeable manner. And yet if you will stand back a little, you will be surprised to realize what fundamental upheavals have taken place in the administrations in the last fifteen years, particularly bearing in mind that the speed of change is usually inversely proportionate to the size of the bodies concerned.

1. The reasons behind the changes on the administrative side

Three of the factors that have brought about the transformations referred to are to be emphasized, namely the schools explosion, the changes that have taken place in public opinion regarding the part education systems should play and, lastly, an increased desire on the part of the general body of the population to have a share in the taking of decisions on how these systems should develop.

In the years between 1960 and 1970 every country in the world has considerably expanded its education system. According to the level of development attained, this expansion has been in primary, secondary or higher education, and cases have been seen where teaching staffs at certain levels have increased three, four or five times in ten years. The administrative side has suddenly found itself managing systems of giant size without anything having been done to change the manner of organization. The rules that had been evolved over the years for the prevention of abuses gradually made it impossible for such enormous systems to operate, and changes in the way the administrative apparatus operated were now vital.

The second factor underlying the above-mentioned institutional changes is more difficult to grasp, concerning as it does a change in the opinion of people at large and those in charge of administration and policies about the part that education can and should play. Last century schooling, being almost exclusively for children from six to twelve, was most often nothing more than the imparting of a course previously decided on. Managing the system meant managing the schools, with the aim of providing enough teachers, enough text-books and enough school equipment in time for the beginning of the school year. At least eighty per cent of the work of the ministries turned on the administration of teaching staffs.

Change has come for two different reasons, of which one may be described as the opening-up of schools to new clienteles, with the addition of pre-school education, special education, out-of-school training of young people, adult education and even, in recent years, life-long education. The administrative side was not equipped to meet the requirements of bodies of people so different from those dealt with hitherto, and began by copying the existing school systems. They soon realized the error in their ways and began to look for new solutions; this meant reorganization.

At the same time, the thoughts and conclusions of educational economists, with those of the sociologists hard on their heels, pointed out the preponderant part education had to play in the evolution and development of society. This being realized, it is no longer possible to agree that the absorbing of a given course by a given body of people is a good thing in itself; on the contrary, quality of education is to be measured in terms of improvements in attitudes and behaviour in the light of the individual social and economic functions the learners will have to take up when their period of schooling terminates. Those administering education systems find themselves as a result shouldering, over and beyond the business of managing, the dual task of determining who needs education and setting out the type of education the chosen are to receive. The once routine work on pedagogy necessarily becomes problematical and creative.

The dogmatic value of the structures and curricula of formal education and the omnipotence of the "top brass" of National Education being thus questioned, the way was open for others wishing to have a say to enter upon a field from which they had so far been barred. Since education is an activity of interest to the whole population, both as potential customers and as the providers of financing, it is normal for them to want to have share in

determining what the major lines of the system are to be and have an influence on the decisions to be taken. This third factor not only necessitates change in the manner of working of the administrative side but also raises a number of questions on how reorganization should take place.

2. The two main changes in administration

Alongside the numerous minor changes in the ministries of education have made in their administrative organization, there are two changes to be noted that go much deeper.

The first concerns the choice of type of structure for central administration. Hitherto, its lay-out in most countries had been sectorial, administrative departments matching the sectors of the education system, that is to say departments parallelling primary and secondary education, teacher training, and higher education where applicable. The new layout breaks with tradition, adopting a functional plan covering usually five main divisions, namely planning and statistics, curriculum and methods, personnel management, management of buildings and equipment and, lastly, finance and budgetary control. There may be variations in the organizational chart from one country to another but the feature common to all is that from now on these functional directorates are called upon to discharge their specific responsibilities right across the board of the education system, without reference to type or level of education.

It was while these reforms were going through that it was realized how great was the paucity of pedagogic services, a paucity that had not necessarily shown up because certain sections officially applying themselves to the improvement of content of education, to the supervising of the educational process or to the evaluation of pedagogic experiments were devoting practically all their efforts to the management and expansion of the existing system. Splitting off the work on contents and methods of education from work on administering the system has consequently been of especial benefit to educational science.

The second big change affecting the administrative side is decentralisation. Leaving aside countries with a federal system, where education is almost always the business of the individual States and not of the federation, ministries of education had been tending since the beginning of the present century to strengthen their control over educational institutions. In a large number of countries all decisions connected with the management of the system i.e. on staff recruitment, school-building and purchases of materials and equipment were taken by

the ministry, for the very good reason that expenditure was involved and the financing of it was from the public purse.

For the last ten years or so, in every continent, we have been witnessing attempts at decentralizing the administrative side. In most cases the reforms brought in reached well beyond the simple setting-up of regional branch establishments such as existed in almost every country, with the main duty of keeping an eye on the legality of administative action taken by school establishments. These decentralized outposts may well have planning, pedagogic and administrative departments, taking decisions without referring to the central authorities or at the very least enjoying a very large measure of freedom of initiative. They have the responsibility of steering the system in the light of a number of nationally laid down principles and also of special regional and local features, of checking on the quality of the educational process, giving assistance where the need of it comes to be felt and managing staffs and equipment located in the region.

The phenomenon of decentraliation is a complex one, sufficiently so for us to examine it in more detail in the pages which follow.

II. Decentralization in educational administration (1)

The first section below will set out what decentralization means and what forms it can take. We shall then examine what are the spheres of administration it can affect. Finally, we shall attempt to see whether there is a necessary connection between decentralization and certain modifications of structure and function in central administration.

1. The forms taken by decentralization

In the foregoing remarks we have made use of the term decentralization in the sense generally given it. Between this and the notion of deconcentration the lawyers make a distinction. It is a distinction which, as we shall see, is useful but inadequate for a description of the existing situations.

Centralization is the act of concentrating in the hands of the State all the administrative tasks envisaged within the bounds of the country(Rivero). Deconcentration is a system of administrative organization under which powers of decision-taking and the competency to effect legal acts committing the body public are bestowed on government servants hierarchically subordinate to the central authority supreme in the matter (Buttgenbach). It is a delegation of power by the central authority to its regional or local servants which does not involve the creation of new institutions or the organization of new policy-making authorities and which, above all, does not set up decision-making centres autonomous in relation to the central authority (Delpérée).

(1) This subject is dealt in more detail in the study done by the author for IIEP under the title "Régionalisation et planification : un nouveau thème de recherche pour la planification de l'Education" initial version of May 1976.

Decentralization, by contrast, involves delegating powers of decision-making on bodies other than mere agents of the central authority, bodies not part of the official hierarchy, frequently bodies that are elected (Vedel). Decentralization thus transfers a real power of decision-making to autonomous institutions, especially regional or local authorities.

This legal survey of the question can be rounded off with a reference to the more sociological distinction made by Elliott Kaques between associations and administrative hierarchies. According to Jaques, an association is any group of individuals governing itself and doing this most often through elected representatives and administrative bodies appointed by these representatives. Administrative hierarchies are precisely these bodies appointed to do the working of the association and consisting of networks of teams each comprising a superior and those subordinate to him. In these circumstances, deconcentration is the delegation by a superior to a subordinate of a part of his powers, and this is done within the confines of an administrative hierarchy. Decentralization on the other hand involves the abandonment to an autonomous "association" of a competency held by central authority. In administrative hierarchies only consultation is possible, a superior will listen to the opinions of his subordinates and himself decide whether to take account of them; in associations on the other hand "participation" comes in when it is a case of defining aims and the general lines of the guidance of the administrative hierarchies.

Regionalization for its part (or the delegating of powers to any second- or lower-tier body) almost always has recourse to two techniques simultaneously, the state at the centre seconds a number of its servants to become the executive of the region and at the same time delegates to a regional council representing the population of the region certain powers of expression of opinion, of control or of decision-making in the matter of the management of regional affairs.

With the work of definition behind us, let us try to see what takes place when a ministry of education delegates certain of its powers to second- or lower-tier authorities. We have the simplest of all cases when the ministry of education is the only ministry carrying out a decentralization of its activities. Suppose for instance that a regional minister is appointed and a number of powers are delegate to him in connection with staff recruitment, preparation of the budget and watching over the educational process. Being still a member of the administrative hierarchy, the minister will always be subordinare to the national minister and in the last resort the latter's views will prevail.

As against this, the situation of the official in charge of the regional budget will be a little more complicated, since he will be administratively under the orders of his regional minister and will also receive instructions of a technical order from the national director of the budget; disputes can be resolved only by the national minister.

We can imagine a second case where all the ministries appoint regional delegates reporting officially to a governor who represents the region's executive. Now it is the regional minister who may find himself receiving contrary instructions from his national minister and from the regional governor. Probably the head of the government will have to come in to give a decision. In both these examples only deconcentration is the order of the day, all conflicts are settled inside the administrative sphere and the final decision is taken by the authority at the head of the hierarchy. Deconcentration possesses enormous advantages over centralisation, in the shape of regional interpretation of national regulations, a more realistic analysis of educational requirements and greater flexibility in the management of the system.

We find however, as we study the development of institutions in the context of regionalization, that deconcentration is frequently only the first step alongthe road to greater decentralization. For as soon as the regional administration begins to deal with questions of development, pressure groups spring up and the State often finds itself obliged to bring these into the decision-making process in the person either of representatives of socio-economic lobbies or of leading personalities or else under a system of direct representation of the people by elected political figures. We then have autonomous associations to whom the central seat of power delegates some of its prerogatives, and this is decentralization in the legal meaning of the term. If ministries of education decide to deconcentrate their work, we reach in certain cases a real situation of decentralization. For as soon as regional or local assemblies begin to take a part in the decision-making process, and as soon as they can put their own particular standards in the place of national regulations, you no longer have more deconcentration. You will have the people of the area (whatever the manner of their representation) steering the education system, and not the administration or the political authorities at the centre.

2. Fields of decentralization

To measure the degree of autonomy enjoyed by a country's second- or lower-tier institutions, it is not sufficient simply to know the form of decentralization the country has chosen. It can happen that a central authority will delegate certain powers to its servants in the outposts or to decentralized associations while keeping in its own hands the decisions on the most important matters. Any administrative activity consists of a long succession of decisions; if some of these, such as for example those concerning the budget, are reserved for the discretionary power of the State, decentralization can only be of little effect. Only an analysis of each of the sectors of the administrative process can bring us to appreciate how far decentralization has actually gone.

The fields in which responsibilities have been decentralized already, or could be progressively be decentralized, are countless; the following paragraphs will consider only the most important of them.

Where the diagnosis of educational requirements is concerned, each body i.e. school, local authority, sub-regional, regional and national levels, can take certain initiatives or take part in the joint work required to be done, such as the collection, checking, processing and analysis of education statistics, demographic studies, the school map on a basis of diagnosis, the requirements of the groups of people concerned, development prospects, cost analysis, and so on.

When education policy is being framed, each of these levels can have a share either in the drawing up of projects on local, regional or national initiative or in the expression of wishes for a switch of overall policy or in connection with the fixing of priorities. It is particularly at local and regional levels that suggestions for the prospective school map must arise, based on long-term aims for schooling and possible structural reforms, and as influenced by the area's geographical, demographic, economic and social features and regional development plans. This school map will cover both primary, secondary and technical education and adult education. Other projects of more qualitative character, such as retraining of teaching staff, organization of inspections or the regionalization of certain curricula contents, will have a better possibility of meeting local requirements if the initiative for framing them is left to those who know the basic hard facts. This kind of decentralization does however raise a problem

connected with the technical side of initiatives that we shall look into later.

Planning is the field most likely to feel the effects of decentralisation of administration. There are some writers who regard planning and decentralization as an almost complete contradiction in terms, since decentralisation implies a measure of freedom of decision for second and lower tiers of authority which at first sight is a negation of the very idea of planning. On the contrary, however, when we examine what has been done in the way of regional planning, both socio-economic and educational, we find that planning and decentralization are mutually enriching but that the harmonization of these two types of organization requires the devising of extremely precise and often very long-winded administrative procesures. This machinery can be categorized on three main lines, namely (1) a sharingout of competencies by subjects, some of these being reserved for central administration and others left to regional and local initiative; (2) the regionalization of the national plan, the regions being responsible for breaking down the central plan and adapting it to the area's particular characteristics, and (3) regional planning with its various elements that come together to produce, after a conciliation procedure, the plan for the country. In point of fact, the experiments that have shown the best results have used the three methods simultaneously in a step-by-step procedure enabling the bodies at various levels to agree on joint or complementary activities and to end by adopting a national plan and several regional plans reconciling the most important desires of the various levels of power.

Implementation of the plan by the educational establishments and the operational teams on the ground has always taken placed by definition, outside the walls of central administration. But the two spheres of activity that support it, namely management administration and substantive administration, have most frequently been completely centralized. Management administration, i.e. staffing, equipment and finance, was either done entirely in the capital or at the very least regulated and controlled by civil servants at the centre. So grievously however has compliance with the old rules been found to slow up the working of the system that the usefulness of deconcentrating this side of the work is no longer questioned. In each country is to be seen total or partial deconcentration of such tasks as assessment of staffing requirments, staff selection and recruitment (with variants according to the level of responsibility), transfers, payment of salaries and allowances, the design, acquisition and maintenance of materials and equipment and buildings, and the control of expenditure. If this reform is not

yet in force everywhere, the reason is most frequently to be found in the opposition of civil servants, either to protect their jobs or to avoid transfer to remote places.

On the other hand, substantive administration, i.e. pedagogical assistance retraining and inspection, seems to present much more difficult when decentralizing is considered, because these aspects of administration are often considered to constitute the guarantee of the standards of high-quality education. Once however, it is admitted that the value of education impacted does not depend on its conforming to a pattern or an ideal programme but on the way it faces and solves problems connected with social integration and the preparation of the individual for his future on the socio-economic scene, decentralization has definite advantages in the shape of greater homogeneity of populations, specificity of the area for development and of its problems, greater facility of cooperating with those dealing with development, more exact determination of requirementsand the possibility of assessing the results of educational work on the spot. Decentralization on these lines means that the teacher should regain an important part of his function - that of deciding on the contents and methods of education that are most appropriate for those on the benches before him. This being so, training and retraining of teachers must comprise also direct preparation for these responsibilities, and this will probably have a specific slant according to the region where it is done.

It is of course easier to visualize regionalization of education when it is a question of non-conventional courses, as for instance remedial courses for drop-outs, on-the-job training courses and adult training, where the aims being pursued are more closely bound up with the conditions in the region, than in connection with general primary and secondary education. These traditional forms of schooling are, we know, often too much stressed in the countries of the Third World, in the sense that they are the cause of a majority of children dropping out of school, frustrated and lacking what is necessary for fitting into life outside. If they are to be reformed, the regional variable will surely have a preponderant role to play. Again, while without doubt these forms of education have a part to play which is of national importance, those coming to them arrive with varying intellectual backgrounds according to the region they belong to, whether it is

rural or urban or one of the great climatic zones, according to their racial culture and the varying levels of education attained by the parents. These differences should be taken account of if good results are to be achieved. Lastly, differing levels of results from one region to another bring to the fore specific requirements for improving the system which it is difficult for national handling to satisfy.

If then the methods of education are to vary from one part of the country to another, and if projects for pedagogical improvement are to overcome specific difficulties, the region should also draw up its own budget to take account of the work to be done. After all, the budget is only the programmed activity seen in financial terms. This is another field where deconcentration can be brought in. A number of countries have already set up the necessary administrative structures that this requires; nonetheless with very few exceptions, the budget is totally financed by the State.

Our rapid survey of the fields in which decentralization is possible and indeed is already being applied in a growing number of countries, makes it clear that these are changes that affect all sides of administrative work.

3. The implications for the structure and functions of central administration

In every case where a ministry has had recourse to decentralization, regional directorates have been set up. The responsibilities which these bear cover a wide spread of levels and types of education and the "regional minister" is solely responsible for the educational activity in his area. So, with forms of education tending more and more to diversify, one can hardly see him reporting to a series of heads of national departments and applying different standards for primary, secondary and adult education. The adoption of a system of functional departments in central administration is almost a corollary of the decision to decentralise - division of responsibility by subject is easier to apply than division by levels.

In a large number of cases decentralization goes down deeper than mere regional level; a greater measure of freedom is given to school headmasters, and local authorities are generally responsible for the development of education. This splitting-up of responsibilities is frequently counterbalanced by the setting-up of a complex network of public servants at all geographical sub-divisions, with officials at national, regional, municipal, county and village level side by side, dealing with statistics, retraining and school inspection as well as with control of expenditure and staff administration. What we have now is not only specialisation by subject but also a swarm of administrators covering the whole country. It can even happen that the term

"administrative official" becomes imprecise when a member of teaching staff at certain hours goes over to administrative duties, where a village teacher is responsible for collecting and checking statistics on his school, a higher teacher of this or that subject has the organizing of vocational guidance tests or some other has the controlling of how teaching equipment is used. Training is a necessity for these, as for any official on administrative work, as we shall see later.

Moreover, structuring of administration is very frequently a two-way street, with subordination in technical matters spreading out its tentacles over the whole country and with officials belonging to various functional departments being brought together in small geographical units under a local head who is responsible for every sector and the coordinator of a team with a wide spread of duties.

These structural changes do not come about without a great measure of change in the work of central administration, for on the one hand it has off-loaded daily tasks onto smaller geographical units and on the other it has created a crowd of partially autonomous decision-making centres which have to have a constant eye on them if the result is not to be a complete break-up of the national system.

This latter duty will account for the largest slice of its activities. A decentralized system is a possibility only if it hinges on an education policy of national scope and only if the autonomous outposts have before them very precise principles to guide them effectively in the drawing-up and carrying-out of their programmes of work.

These national principles cannot be arbitrarily dictated for they could then run the risk of being rejected by the outposts. They must take account of the cares and wishes of those at the grass-roots. "Participation" is vital to this prime task of central administration which must enquire after the problems and take note of the suggestions of those who are face to face with the facts of daily life, and reconcile the desiderata and produce a synthesis. This synthesis when arrived at has not the mere single aim of fixing the national aims of education, it is concerned with all fields of administrative work, with unifying the collection of information and its presentation, not forgetting either the specific requirements of each level or the absolute necessity of homogeneity in national statistics; with the standardization of planning techniques, with the systematization of methods for planning the curriculum and of standards for assessment, with the

standardization of planning techniques, with the systematization of methods for planning the curriculum and of standards for assessment, with the arriving at a national policy on staffing and the adoption of common standards on the management of materials and equipment, of buildings and of finances.

These principles however are useless unless they are made widely known and understood and applied at all levels of administrations. Herein resides the second duty of the officials at the centre, that of informing, educating and stimulating those below themselves throughout the national official body. This broadened supervisory work has only a remote resemblance with what used to be called "inspection", which was mainly concerned with checking on the proper application of centrally-imposed regulations. Now, rather, the task is to get into everybody's head the aims of education and the standards for applying them in practice, to give the outposts the intellectual and technical means of attaining those aims, to act as a technical aide when temporary difficulties arise and, where necessary, to step in with active aid for offices that may be faltering. The importance of this new function of the administration side justifies our devoting the third section of this paper to it.

And finally, the third great task of central administration is in connection with balance as between the regions. There are areas that are backward and others going ahead strongly. The central authorities are under a duty of contriving, by means of a complex application of reconciliation, coordination, encouragement and assistance, to reduce prevailing disparities and create a great measure of national uniformity.

III. The training of administrative staff

Most countries have no specific training system for administrative staff dealing with the education system and most of the officials are former teachers who have been promoted. It is a state of affairs that one may find regrettable but any thought of modifying it in the short term would be vain. In any case this procedure has a positive side in that it opens up promotion possibilities for teachers with the particular aptitudes required. If there cannot be any change in the manner of recruitment, at least it should be possible to improve on the training of the new recruits when they take up their new duties. Possibilities of training exist in many countries but too often they are reserved for limited categories of officials, for inspectors, in teaching training colleges for experts in education science, in the country's or foreign universities, or

for planners, most often under multinational arrangements. The administrative reorganization being undertaken should provide an opportunity for reconsidering training programmes with a view to taking care of the new structures and responsibilities and seeing to it that these programmes cover all the requirements of the system.

1. Quantity and qualifications

We have seen in the preceding paragraphs that administration is reorganizing itself in two directions. Firstly, it is bringing into being five pyramids each of a single function, with their tops in the capital city. Two of these five are charged with the duty of defining who needs education for coping later with what sort of duties, and in what manner the chosen are to be educated and trained; these are the department for planning and pedagogy. The three others have the duty of supporting the work of education, being responsible for staffing, materials and equipment, and finances respectively. At the same time, there is a degree of overlapping and officials from each department are to be found as members of teams from more than one department at the various levels of the geographical fractionalization.

Training of administrative staffs must therefore first equip officials for their specialized work in the sector they belong to, and secondly, bestow on them the ability to work as members of a team and support the work being done in outpost units.

Every official in each of the sectors must have completely absorbed the country's education policy, be in agreement with his sector's guiding principles and have mastered the specific techniques of his particular job. It is particularly under the last head that there will be the most marked differences according to the rung on the official ladder the person in question is to occupy. Thus, in the sphere of planning, the officials at central headquarters must be able to adapt overall methodologies to particular cases in the regions, regional officials must be able to apply them with the understanding and interpret the results that follow, sub-regional staffs at first will probably have duties only in connection with execution and will have to be qualified to collect requested information correctly and employ certain simply techniques such as drawing-up of the school map. It is not to be lost sight of that in the case of effective decentralization the techniques to be followed in each region may vary either in obedience to objective criteria(1) or by reason of political decisions taken by regional or local bodies.

(1) For instance, in a region where there is an homogenous spread of population, the whole methodology of the school map can be based on the idea of population density, while this would not be applicable in a desert area with its population crowded into a number of urban centres.

Training embracing several disciplines for team-work seldom receives the attention it requires, but is none the less of the highest importance, for if officials are working without any real spirit of co-operation they will be unable to agree on priorities and solve the most urgent problems arising in their sphere of action. What efforts have been thrown away and goodwill illused because a programme that was very well thought out was applied to problems without the slightest importance for the system as a whole!

The conclusion therefore is that all administrative officials require training on two separate lines. A man's training for his specialized job will be the more thorough the higher is the central position he is to occupy on the official ladder. Training for team-work will have to be done at all levels.

2. The organizing of training

Setting up specialized schools for all administrative officials is of course unthinkable. The cost would be prohibitive and also the administration would be halted all the time the officials were being trained. Apart from a number of specialists who can receive further training in institutions of higher learning, most of the officials can be trained adequately by means of seminars of short duration which if necessary can be spread over a number of years and linked up into a training course.

If all officials from top to bottom are to be included, it will be necessary to hold courses at each of the geographical levels. The only profitable way of organizing such training is to use the administrative network itself as the channel for teaching. Headquarters officials will begin by training their opposite numbers in the regions; these in turn will convery the necessary knowledge to their opposite numbers in the sub-regions, who will have the duty of informing the officials on the ground. Such a system cannot be improvised; the organization of seminars, the choice of subjects to underlie training according to the geographical level, the preparing and distribution of teaching material, the programming of the work to fit in with the administrative time-table and the drawing-up of the budgets necessary is in itself a complicated administrative business which can only be carried out by an official specially appointed to coordinate it.

All this will take still more time if the seminars are to deal with the training requirements felt and declared by the officials themselves. An examination of operational defects and a seeking-out of gaps in the knowledge possessed by officials through a process of self-assessment will correspondingly lengthen the courses but also considerably increase their value.

Training for specialized duties, i.e. the training provided in each of the five big divisions, can be given in the national, regional or sub-regional capitals where the regional, sub-regional and local officials respectively would assemble. If however the dual principle of divisional specialization and broader training for effective team-work is to be respected, there will have to be, in addition to these seminars for divisional purposes, joint educational sessions to prepare for co-operation between the divisions.

For this there are two possible solutions. Either the same seminar would be held for each of the administration teams of a given geographical level, at the usual place of work of each, or five parallel specialized seminars would be arranged in the main administrative centres. During the period of the seminars there would be a number of meetings for experts from the various divisions, each of them contributing his techniques and knowledge to the solution of a common problem. Actually, the two methods should complement each other, the first being more suitable for follow-up and direct technical assistance, the second being better for meeting the requirements of systematic training. In either case, the best results are obtained if the teaching given is built round an actual or imagined project, this allows a study to be made of all the stages of the administrative process and lets the assembled officials have their say in an atmosphere very close to reality.

For instance, the seminar can begin with an official statement on the national priorities for education. The team-leader, planner and pedagogic expert next analyse a given sector of population, fix specific educational aims for it and put forward a number of alternative schemes. Aided by the three other experts, they make an estimate of the staffing and materials requirements arising and state these in terms of budget

proposals. When the most appropriate solution has been decided on, each of the experts sets out the work required in his sector for the carrying-out of the project. Before, during and after the joint sessions there are specialized lectures on the particular techniques of each sector with the object of fitting the officials to carry out their duties more efficiently.

These seminars have the additional advantage of providing the higher officials who are acting as the teachers of the meeting with an interesting feedback on their own work. They quickly come to see that this or that proceeding devised inside the four walls of their office is not applicable in the conditions of real life outside, that conditions peculiar to this or that region call for special rulings or - and this is a frequent finding - that headquarters do not rate sufficiently highly the capabilities of the officials in the outposts and do not allow them sufficient freedom of initiative. Training in fact is reciprocal and has a direct effect on the improvement of administrative procedures.

This basic pattern can be modified in numerous ways. The important thing is to realise if bodies of officials get one-track training the inevitable result will be that they willwork in isolation when they get back to their desks. This is probably one of the reasons why planning has had very little influence on the behaviour of the administrative side during the last fifteen years. The second important point is that staff training is not an optional additional activity in ministries. It is one of the integral parts of administration work, making its demands on the managerial side, where general guidelines are to be provided, on the dissemination of information and on the follow-up of what is done.

3. Some further features of training

Given the close connection between training and the work done on the administration side, subjects chosen for training lectures must be very close to the work that is to be done. Both in respect of their content (for it is useless, for instance, to teach all the officials in the ministry about PERT when most of the administrative work done is relatively simple) and also in respect of their programming. This last point needs to be insisted on; there is a lot of work that is done again and again throughout the year and there is work that is tied to a previously a arranged timetable, for instance the beginning of the school-year or the

drawing-up of the budget. Training will be more effective for being linked with what is done in preparation of the start-up of this work. One of the most important timetables is the one for the drawing-up of the education plan, which can stretch over a number of years and goes through a number logical stages beginning with the work on diagnosis and ending when the plan is finally adopted. The great majority of the officials on the administration side should be brought into the work on this plan, whatever their special duties. This is a prime subject and one on which a staff-training timetable covering several can be hinged.

The aim of a training system on these lines is not to perpetuate existing bureaucratic procedures; on the contrary, its prime aim is to increase efficiency. This means that preparatory work on subjects for training lectures has to be given very special attention. The following may serve as a guide: applied research, circumscription of a problem and work towards a solution, guidance from higher officials, taking of decision, devising of the new methodology, shaping of the new steps to be taken and the taking of them. Take for instance the case of deciding on new schools. Statistical analysis makes it clear that not rational but electoral factors determine the geographical distribution of schools. In a memorandum addressed to the minister, the planning department states its intention to follow school-map procedures in deciding where new educational establishments shall be located. The minister is in agreement with the principle but wishes to see a precise example before enacting the regulations necessary. An experiment done in a pilot area leads to the minister being convinced. During their research work, the planning officials have worked out a methodology appropriate to the country's demographic and geographical conditions and the statistical data available from recent census reports. A few weeks before the decree is brought out, training seminars are organized throughout the country to acquaint officials with the nature of the new work to be done. The necessary connection between research-work, innovation, decision-making and training is clearly to be seen from this example.

It also demonstrates that training has to be done within the ambit of administration itself. It is not to be entrusted to outside bodies such as the universities, for the danger can arise of the spirit of independence there prevailing casting doubt on the political objectives being pursued: sub-contracting however is possible, with the ministry continuing to figure

as clerk of the works. For the same reasons, those concerned with the co-ordination of training work must be sufficiently highly-placed officials with access to those framing the policy of the ministry and the division concerned. Various schemes are possible; a number of South-American countries have an education-staffs retraining centre, in some cases for teaching staffs only, with the duty of organizing training on the job, and enjoying a certain degree of autonomy in relation to the administration side. This manner of operating, while possessing undisputable advantages, such as the specialization possible and a consistency in the training of all types of staff, is possibly not the best since there can be discrepancy between the training afforded and the principles followed by the administrative authorities. It seems that each ministry division should be responsible for its own work on training; each official would be required to devote part of his time to training his opposit numbers at regional or local level. Co-ordination of training involving more than one division could be a matter for an ad hoc committee possibly assisted by a permanent secretariat.

Finally, a few remarks on those to benefit by training. As already stated, all officials concerned with administration need continuing training, in whatever sector they work and whatever the grade of their job, for it is agreement on aims that guarantees the consistency of decentralized systems. Training on these lines should be reserved first for officials already on the job or those whose post has already been sanctioned. Appointments are the plaything of political contingencies and job-creations often become doubtful quantities when the budget is being discussed, with the result that any training given before the beneficiary takes up his duties can be a matter of chance. This is not a bar to initial training, which in most cases means training for teaching duties, including basic instruction on the working of education system and the way it is administered. More thorough analysis should be undertaken to determine the minimum content of such training common to all those working for the system.

Summary

In connection with recent developments in the administration of education systems two major changes are to be seen, namely a going over to a structure on functional lines, and decentralization. Side by side with this development, we see change taking place in the work of the higher echelons on the administration side, including the fact that training of staff in outposts resulting from the process of decentralization is now an intrinsic part of administration work; we have also stressed that

training is both one of the bulwarks guaranteeing the national unity of the system and one of the means making possible the constant adaptation of administrative infrastructures to the way their tasks evolve. The training pattern put forward in this paper represents an attempt at adapting to these features.